

Pig's



Head

University of Queensland Debating Society

Tomas Heard, Lauren Humphrey, and Alex Molloy
Issue 2 2010

UQ Debating Rises Again at Easter

UQ once again performed strongly at the Australian Intersivity Debating Championships, affectionately known as 'Easters'. UQ2 (Emily Chalk, Rebecca Conrick and Lucy Wark) were runners-up, losing to University of Sydney Union 4 in a 5-2 split decision, where the Chief Adjudicator decided the debate in their favour. UQ1 (Sarida McLeod, Marc Harris and Pat Begley) also performed strongly, reaching the quarter-finals and going out on a 2-1 split decision. The other two UQ teams performed strongly, both winning at least half their debates. UQ 3 was very unlucky to miss out on the break - being less than 1 speaker point behind the 16th ranked team.

Emily Chalk was the 4th best speaker overall and Tom Ashby the 10th.

6 of UQ's adjudicators broke. David Stephens, Byron Hewson, Anthony Smith and Parker Reeve adjudicated the Octo Finals. Kristen Price and the tournament's deputy chief adjudicator, Lauren Humphrey both adjudicated the semi-finals, but were prevented from adjudicating the final due to UQ2's success.

Thomas Ashby

Social report

What started as the contingent with 'too many dicks on the dance floor' ironically ended with a heroic triumph from three females members of the society making the grand final.

However, simply put, that is not the point of this article.

On Tuesday afternoon, our Queensland heroes arrived in Melbourne with palm cards, alcohol and many stories complaining about their respective forms of transport. (just ask Eloise and Byron why they will never fly Tiger again) When the drinking began, so did the carnage. In a joint tie for the "way too drunk way too early" award, Anthony Smith (ABS) and Emily Chalk decided that 8 o'clock (before the social began) was an appropriate time to call an end to the festivities. Adding to his infamous "starfuck" collection of awards, ABS also collected the inaugural David Stephens prize for throwing up in your room mate's suitcase. Not to be outdone, Andrew McKechnie managed to get him self booted from a social event for a combination of dropping his pants on the dance floor (Eagle Rock was on) and playing the race card on a black bouncer. As the tournament progressed, Bec Conrick and Ged Forrest found out what the water tastes like in Western Australia and New South Wales respectively whilst Parker Reeve simply found out how Nick Denham tastes. On the poor form front, slightly edging Ben Taylor's cock-blocking attempts, Andrew Suffern takes out gong for telling a Sydney uni girl (who was probably the second best looking girl in the tournament) to "fuck off Sydney." Final night arrived, and Marc 'Calvin' Harris found out how it sucks to be an international DJ stuck in a debater's body whilst Melbourne Uni clearly proved why the organization of awesome final night parties should be left to Queenslanders.

Andrew McKechnie

UQDS 2010 Calendar

May – Girls Night

May – Boys Night

13th, 20th, 27th April, 4th, 11th, 18th, 25th May, and 1st June – Rounds 1-6, Semi-Finals and Grand Finals of Open Internal Competition

May-June – Grand Final Drinks

June – Australs Sendoff Party

Wednesday 30 June –

Wednesday 7th July – Australasian intersivity Debating Championships (Australs) Hosted by Auckland University

July – Race Day Party

26th July – Semester 2 Classes Begin

27th July – Demonstration British Parliamentary (BP) Style Debate

3rd, 10th August – BP Practice Rounds 1 and 2

August – Taco Tuesday

17th, 24th, 31st August, 7th, 14th, 21st September BP Competition Rounds 1-6

5th October – UQ Debating Society Annual General Meeting

12th, 19th October – BP Semi-Finals and Grand Finals

October – BP Grand Final Afterparty

26th October – UQDS End of Season Function: Big Jugs, Hot sauce and Guacamole

November – UQDS Ball

The *Secret* to Stopping Debates from Going Off the Rails

Setting the scene or Contextualisation: Making debates fun and interesting

Do any of the following sound familiar? Teams who couldn't agree on what the debate was about? *or* Teams who got away with misrepresenting the hell out of each other and never engaged? Then chances are the affirmative team didn't contextualise the debate properly.

Make your debate interesting: Explain why you are even having the debate!

It sounds almost too obvious but oftentimes teams can go through a whole debate without explaining *why* anyone should care about it. That's a recipe for boredom. Get your 'problem' out there early and the audience is more likely to bother to listen to the rest of the debate. Put simply an affirmative team needs to give a *reason* (in debating jargon, an 'imperative') why we should bother to change anything at all – what's problem with the status quo? Hint: As a general rule change is effort so we don't bother unless there's a good reason.

The politicians approach: Tailor your 'problem' so you have a chance at solving it.

Too many well-meaning debaters try to make their imperative a huge problem - let's say dictatorships are bad - and then suggest a solution that cannot possibly hope to overthrow dictatorial regimes around the world. That's a credibility loser. Make your problem too large and no one will take you seriously. At the World Debating Championships the fourth round motion was: That this House believes that Government should subsidise interracial and interfaith marriage. Some 'cunning' teams thought they would set this debate in conflict-ridden countries like Israel and Palestine. The *problem* is no one seriously thinks that the Israeli Palestinian conflict can be solved by a few marriages. Those 'cunning' teams sounded foolish.

Avoid making your debate painful - rule out annoying and irrelevant side issues/situations

A context is the perfect place to crack out examples – by the end of it the audience should know what kind of scenario you think the debate is about. Ask yourself: What kind of people and places are central to this debate (and almost as importantly which aren't)? Another topic at Worlds was: That this House would punish communities for honour killings. Some negative teams decided it would be a good idea to discuss countries where many honour killings occur (and this model definitely wouldn't work) like Iran and Saudi Arabia. Those countries often openly endorse honour killings – it is pretty damn obvious we're *not* talking about those countries. Pity that affirmative teams didn't clearly rule them out from the get-go by providing examples of *actually* relevant countries (Turkey etc).

Contextualise!

Lazy teams either forget or simply can't be bothered contextualizing because they assume everyone will get what it's about. Those teams lose debates more often than they should to annoying teams who aren't nearly as good because the debate got so messy the adjudicator had no idea what the hell was going on. And even if they win, their debates are more likely to be BORING. Contextualise! You won't know how you ever debated without it. Besides in 9 out of 10 debates it's not like you'll have a better idea for how to begin your speech.